arXiv:1511.04385v2 [quant-ph] 24 Sep 2016

Factoring Safe Semiprimes with a Single Quantum Query

Frédéric Grosshans,[1] Thomas Lawson,[2] François Morain,[3] and Benjamin Smith[4]

[1] *Laboratoire Aimé Cotton, CNRS, Univ. Paris-Sud, ENS Cachan, Univ. Paris-Saclay, 91405 Orsay, France*
[2] *LTCI — Télécom ParisTech, 23 avenue d'Italie, 75013, Paris, France*
[3] *École Polytechnique/LIX and Institut national de recherche en informatique et en automatique (INRIA)*
[4] *INRIA and École Polytechnique/LIX*

(Dated: September 27, 2016)

Shor's factoring algorithm (SFA), by its ability to efficiently factor large numbers, has the potential to undermine contemporary encryption. At its heart is a process called order finding, which quantum mechanics lets us perform efficiently. SFA thus consists of a *quantum order finding algorithm* (QOFA), bookended by classical routines which, given the order, return the factors. But, with probability up to 1/2, these classical routines fail, and QOFA must be rerun. We modify these routines using elementary results in number theory, improving the likelihood that they return the factors.

We present a new quantum factoring algorithm based on QOFA which is better than SFA at factoring safe semiprimes, an important class of numbers used in cryptography (and reputed to be the hardest to factor). With just one call to QOFA, our algorithm almost always factors safe semiprimes. As well as a speed-up, improving efficiency gives our algorithm other, practical advantages: unlike SFA, it does not need a randomly picked input, making it simpler to construct in the lab; and in the (unlikely) case of failure, the same circuit can be rerun, without modification.

We consider generalizing this result to other cases, although we do not find a simple extension, and conclude that SFA is still the best algorithm for general numbers (non safe semiprimes, in other words). Even so, we present some simple number theoretic tricks for improving SFA in this case.

INTRODUCTION

Shor's factoring algorithm (SFA) [1] is the most promising application of quantum computers. Like classical factoring algorithms, it returns a nontrivial factor of an integer $N = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{e_i}$, where the p_i are primes, with $p_i \neq p_j$ and $e_i > 0$. But, unlike its classical counterparts, SFA does this efficiently—its runtime increases just polynomially in the length of N, as opposed to subexponentially for the best classical algorithms. This speed-up is due to the quantum subroutine at the heart of SFA, the quantum order finding algorithm (QOFA). QOFA efficiently calculates the *order* of an integer a modulo N: that is, given coprime integers a and N, QOFA returns the smallest integer $r > 0$ such that $a^r \bmod N = 1$, where mod is the *modulo operator*. (In practice, QOFA is only guaranteed to return a divisor of the order.)

SFA proceeds as follows: an integer a is chosen at random. In the unlikely event that $\gcd(a, N)$ (the *greatest common divisor* of a and N) is greater than 1, then we have already found a nontrivial factor of N. Otherwise, we use QOFA to find the order r of a modulo N. If r is even (which occurs with probability at least 1/2), then a factor of N may be given by $\gcd(a^{r/2} \pm 1, N)$. If a factor is not found, or if r is odd, then the procedure is relaunched with a different random value of a [1, 2].

Much work has been done on the quantum part of the algorithm [3–9]. In this letter we take a different approach: we reduce the probability of failure by applying elementary results in number theory to the *classical* part of SFA.

Our main result concerns *safe semiprimes*, defined here to be the product $N = p_1 p_2$ of two safe primes p_1 and p_2 of the form $p_i = 2q_i + 1$, where q_i is prime. Safe primes were introduced by Sophie Germain in her study of Fermat's last theorem [10]; they are now called *safe* because their products are the hardest to factor using Pollard's "$p - 1$" factoring algorithm [11]. Although safe semiprimes are no longer necessary for RSA [12, 13], they are still used in cryptography [14].

We present an algorithm which, given one call to QOFA, factors safe semiprimes N with probability $\approx 1 - 4/N$. In contrast, for a single query of QOFA, SFA's classical routines fail to factor these numbers half the time.

At the core of our algorithm is the simple observation that for these numbers, the output d of QOFA always divides $2q_1q_2$, and all divisors of $2q_1q_2$, except 1 and 2, allow to compute p_1 and p_2. This information, contained in d, is not used optimally by SFA. Interestingly, the property that makes safe semiprimes the hardest numbers to factor using Pollard's classical $p - 1$ algorithm is exactly that which makes them easy to factor with our quantum algorithm. We also consider moving from the special case of safe semiprimes to general numbers. Although the proofs do not extend naturally, we find a few tricks that may make factoring general numbers easier.

The idea of modifying the classical parts of SFA so as to reduce the dependence on QOFA is not new, although previous studies fine-tune the algorithm, rather than re-think part of it, as we try to do. References [15–17] discuss how best to pick a to maximize the probability

of factoring. References [1, 18] increase efficiency by extracting r from failed outputs of QOFA. These results offer practical advantages beyond simple theoretical improvements: although efficient in theory, in practice each call to QOFA needs an individual experiment, which is time-consuming and costly in resources. Indeed, for some architectures—photonics, for instance—each experiment requires a new circuit.

Beyond its low failure rate, our algorithm has two advantages when factoring safe semiprimes (and possibly a larger class of numbers). The first is that rather than picking the value of a randomly, we can keep it constant. In this letter we use $a = 2$, in the hope that, by matching the dimension of a *qubit*—the basic building block of quantum computers—we may make building the circuit easier. The second is that, when our algorithm does fail, exactly the same circuit can be used again, unlike SFA which needs to be reset with a different value of a.

ELEMENTARY NUMBER THEORY AND QUANTUM FACTORING ALGORITHMS

We write $x \mid y$ to mean x is a *divisor* of y: that is, there exists an integer z such that $y = xz$. A positive integer is *prime* if it has no divisors other than itself and 1. If $y_1, \ldots, y_k$ are integers, then $\gcd(y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ denotes their greatest common divisor: that is, the largest positive integer x such that $x \mid y_i$ for all $1 \le i \le k$. Dually, $\operatorname{lcm}(y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ denotes the least common multiple of the y_i: that is, the smallest positive integer x such that $y_i \mid x$ for all $1 \le i \le k$.

Two concepts from elementary number theory will be essential throughout this letter. In the following

$$N = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{e_i} \ ,$$

where the p_i are distinct primes. The first important concept is the Euler ϕ function,

$$\phi(N) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{e_i - 1}(p_i - 1), \tag{1}$$

which gives the number of integers x in $[1, N]$ such that $\gcd(x, N) = 1$. The second is the Carmichael λ function, $\lambda(N)$, defined as the smallest integer such that $x^{\lambda(N)} \bmod N = 1$ for *every* x satisfying $\gcd(x, N) = 1$. It follows that if r is the order of some a modulo N, then $r \mid \lambda(N)$. Carmichael's theorem shows that if N factors as above, then

$$\lambda(N) = \operatorname{lcm}(\lambda(p_1^{e_1}), \ldots, \lambda(p_k^{e_k})) \ , \tag{2}$$

where

$$\lambda(p_i^{e_i}) = \phi(p_i^{e_i}) \text{ for odd primes } p_i, \tag{3}$$

$$\lambda(2^{e_i}) = \frac{1}{2}\phi(2^{e_i}) = 2^{e_i - 2} \text{ for } e_i > 2, \tag{4}$$

and $\lambda(2^1) = 1$, $\lambda(2^2) = 2$.

A *semiprime* is a product of two primes, hence finding any nontrivial factor of a semiprime amounts to finding its complete prime factorization. An odd prime p is called *safe* if $(p-1)/2$ is also prime (note that $p - 1$ is always divisible by 2 when p is odd, so p being safe can be understood to mean that $p - 1$ is "as close to prime as possible"). A *safe semiprime* is a product of two safe primes.

If $N = p_1 p_2$ is a semiprime [19] (including—but not restricted to—the case of safe semiprimes), then knowing $\phi(N)$ is sufficient for finding a factor of N. Indeed, the factors can be found immediately and deterministically. In this case $\phi(N) = N + 1 - (p_1 + p_2)$ which, when solved simultaneously with $N = p_1 p_2$, gives a factor. Explicitly, expanding the product $(X - p_1)(X - p_2)$ shows that p_1 and p_2 are the solutions of the quadratic equation

$$X^2 - (N - \phi(N) + 1)X + N = 0 \ . \tag{5}$$

For general $N = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{e_i}$, Miller [20] has shown that knowing both N and $\phi(N)$ lets us efficiently factor N probabilistically, or deterministically under the extended Riemann hypothesis.

Let $N = p_1 p_2$ be a safe semiprime, so $p_1 = 2q_1 + 1$ and $p_2 = 2q_2 + 1$ with q_1 and q_2 both prime. SFA chooses a random residue a modulo N and attempts to compute its order r using a call to QOFA. SFA iterates this process until r is even and $a^{r/2}$ is not congruent to -1 modulo N; if $r = \operatorname{ord}_N(a)$, then $\gcd(a^{r/2} - 1, N)$ yields a factor of N (either p_1 or p_2).

We have $\phi(N) = 4q_1 q_2$ and $\lambda(N) = 2q_1 q_2$. As noted above, if r is the order of some a modulo N, then $r \mid \lambda(N)$; so r must be one of the eight divisors of $2q_1 q_2$. Their frequencies are listed in Table I.

We emphasize that, despite its name, QOFA does *not* always return the order of a modulo N. Indeed, the result of the quantum Fourier transform in QOFA yields the fraction $t/\operatorname{ord}_N(a)$ for some integer t uniformly randomly chosen from $\{1, \ldots, \operatorname{ord}_N(a)\}$, and QOFA then returns the denominator $d = \operatorname{ord}_N(a)/\gcd(t, \operatorname{ord}_N(a))$ of that fraction. The probability that this is the true order depends visibly on the number of nontrivial divisors of $\operatorname{ord}_N(a)$.

We can use Table I to prove that if N is a safe semiprime and we sample a uniformly at random, then each iteration of SFA yields a factor of N with probability $\le 1/2$. The probability would be exactly $1/2$ if QOFA were a perfect order finding algorithm: looking at Table I, we see that for a given a we have $P(r \text{ is even}) = 3/4$, but then $P(a^{r/2} \not\equiv -1 \pmod N) = 2/3$; so the probability that a uniformly randomly chosen a yields a factor is $3/4 \cdot 2/3 = 1/2$. Taking QOFA imperfection into account (that is, the fact that QOFA sometimes returns a proper divisor of $\operatorname{ord}_N(a)$) decreases this probablility. It follows that if N is a safe semiprime, then the expected number

TABLE I: The possible multiplicative orders for integers modulo safe semiprimes $N = p_1p_2$ (where $p_i = 2q_i + 1$ with p_1, p_2, q_1, and q_2 all prime). The number of integers is deduced from the isomorphism between the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$ and the product of cyclic groups $C_{2q_1} \times C_{2q_2}$.

r	Number of integers $1 \le a < N$ of order r	Restrictions on a
1	1	$a = 1$
2	3	$a = N - 1$ and two other $a \ge \sqrt{N+1} > 2$
q_1	$q_1 - 1$	$a \ne 2$
q_2	$q_2 - 1$	$a \ne 2$
$2q_1$	$3(q_1 - 1)$	$a \ne 2$
$2q_2$	$3(q_2 - 1)$	$a \ne 2$
q_1q_2	$(q_1 - 1)(q_2 - 1)$	
$2q_1q_2$	$3(q_1 - 1)(q_2 - 1)$	

of iterations of SFA—and hence the expected number of calls to QOFA—is ≥ 2. When $a = 2$ is fixed and the safe semiprime is chosen randomly, SFA is conjectured to succeed with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. A numerical investigation of all the 960,392,564 safe primes $p_i \le 10^{12}$ indeed gives success probability $\frac{1}{2} - 2.06 \times 10^{-10}$.

We propose a new, simple quantum factoring algorithm which almost always succeeds in factoring a safe semiprime $N = p_1p_2 = (2q_1 + 1)(2q_2 + 1)$ with exactly *one* call to QOFA.

The algorithm is given in pseudocode in Algorithm 1. It is based on Lemma 1 which shows that the only two possible values for $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$ are q_1q_2 and $2q_1q_2$, and that QOFA returns a useful factor of $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$ with extremely high probability.

Lemma 1. *Let $N = p_1p_2 = (2q_1 + 1)(2q_2 + 1)$ be a safe semiprime, with $q_1 \ne q_2$ and $q_1, q_2 > 2$ (so in particular, p_1 and p_2 are distinct safe primes greater than 3). Then*

1. *$\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$ is either q_1q_2 or $2q_1q_2$.*
2. *QOFA yields $d \in \{q_1, q_2, q_1q_2, 2q_1, 2q_2, 2q_1q_2\}$ with probability $1 - \frac{1}{q_1q_2} \sim 1 - \frac{4}{N}$; otherwise, $d \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof. Referring to Table I, we know that there are only eight possibilities for the order of an integer modulo N: namely, the four odd values 1, q_1, q_2, and q_1q_2, and the four even values 2, $2q_1$, $2q_2$, and $2q_1q_2$. But $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$ can never be 1 or 2, since $N > 3$. Now, note that $\mathrm{ord}_N(2) = \mathrm{lcm}(\mathrm{ord}_{p_1}(2), \mathrm{ord}_{p_2}(2))$ (since $p_1 \ne p_2$) and $\mathrm{ord}_{p_i}(2) \mid \lambda(p_i) = 2q_i$. Hence, $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$ cannot be q_1, q_2, $2q_1$, or $2q_2$, since otherwise $\mathrm{ord}_{p_2}(2)$ would in $\{1, 2\}$, which contradicts $p_2 > 5$. The only remaining possibilities for $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$ are q_1q_2 and $2q_1q_2$, which proves the first statement.

For the second statement, recall that QOFA returns $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)/\gcd(t, \mathrm{ord}_N(2))$ for some uniformly randomly distributed integer t in $\{1, \ldots, \mathrm{ord}_N(2)\}$. But we have just seen that the value of $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$ can only be q_1q_2 or $2q_1q_2$. If $\mathrm{ord}_N(2) = q_1q_2$ then QOFA only returns 1 if $t = q_1q_2$, which occurs with probability $1/(q_1q_2)$; it cannot return 2. If $\mathrm{ord}_N(2) = 2q_1q_2$ then QOFA returns 1 if $t = 2q_1q_2$ and 2 if $t = q_1q_2$; the probability of t taking one of these two values is $2/(2q_1q_2) = 1/(q_1q_2)$. Hence, regardless of the true value of $\mathrm{ord}_N(2)$, the probability of having a "bad" t leading to a result of 1 or 2 is $1/(q_1q_2)$, which tends to $4/N$ for large N. □

Let d be the result of QOFA applied to 2 modulo N. Our algorithm then attempts to recover the factors of N from d. The cases of odd and even d are virtually identical, and we can unify them by setting $s = d$ if d is even, and $s = 2d$ if d is odd; then $s = 2$, $2q_1$, $2q_2$, or $2q_1q_2$. The case $s = 2$ is trivial to recognise, and we can determine whether $s = 2q_1q_2$ or one of the $2q_i$ using the elementary inequality $2q_1, 2q_2 < N/3 < 2q_1q_2$. If s is one of the $2q_i$ then $s + 1$ is one of the p_i (and $N/(s + 1)$ is the other). If s is $2q_1q_2$ then we recover p_1 and p_2 by using $\phi(N) = 2s$ in Eq. 5 and applying the quadratic formula: the factors of N are $t \pm \sqrt{t^2 - N}$, where $t = (N + 1)/2 - s$. In the unlikely event that $s = 2$ (probability $\sim 4/N$, according to Lemma 1, which is negligible even for moderate N) then we fail to factor N.

Compared to SFA, the advantages of our algorithm are:

1. It requires only one call to QOFA.
2. It only ever computes the order of 2 modulo N, rather than randomly (or specially) chosen $1 < a < N$; this may be helpful when implementing QOFA, since multiplication by 2 is a simple bitshift.
3. The probability of failure decreases exponentially with the length (in bits) of N.
4. In the unlikely event of failure, then we can attempt to factor N by simply running *exactly the same algorithm* again. In contrast to SFA, rather than changing the base, we can repeat with the convenient $a = 2$.

In particular, our algorithm is never slower than SFA. Indeed, the only way that SFA can beat it is to never call QOFA, which means the very first randomly chosen a must be a factor of N; but this is extremely improbable for even moderate-sized N.

Our algorithm and its analysis imply that safe semiprimes, (which are considered the hardest inputs for classical factoring algorithms) are among the easiest inputs for quantum factoring algorithms.

Algorithm 1 only works for safe semiprimes: indeed, its correctness depends on the extremely small number of divisors of $\lambda(N)$ when N is a safe semiprime. It does

Algorithm 1 Given a safe semiprime $N = p_1 p_2$, where $p_1 = 2q_1 + 1$ and $p_2 = 2q_2 + 1$ with p_1, p_2, q_1, and q_2 all distinct primes, returns $\{p_1, p_2\}$ or `Failure`

function FactorSafeSemiprime(N)
  if $5 \mid N$ **then return** $\{5, N/5\}$
  $d \leftarrow$ Qofa$(2, N)$
  if $2 \mid d$ **then** $s \leftarrow d$
  else $s \leftarrow 2d$
  if $s = 2$ **then return** `Failure` ▷ Prob. $1/(q_1 q_2)$
  if $s < N/3$ **then** $p \leftarrow s + 1$ ▷ $s = 2q_1$ or $2q_2$
  else ▷ $s = 2q_1 q_2$
    $t \leftarrow (N+1)/2 - s$
    $p \leftarrow t + \sqrt{t^2 - N}$
  return $\{p, N/p\}$

not generalize to more general odd composites N, nor even to products of two primes where only one prime is safe, without further information on the factors of N.

For example, suppose $N = p_1 p_2$ where $p_1 = 2q_1 + 1$ with q_1 prime and $p_2 = 2q_2 q_2' + 1$ where q_2 and q_2' are prime (that is, p_1 is safe and p_2 is "almost safe"). Then $\lambda(N) = 2q_1 q_2 q_2'$, which has sixteen divisors, so there are sixteen possible orders for integers modulo N. Suppose QOFA returns the correct order r of 2 (or of any other a) modulo N. The most common element order is $2q_1 q_2 q_2'$; but this value of r does *not* immediately yield factors of N. If $r = q_1$, then $(2r+1)$ is a factor of N; but if $r = q_2$ or q_2', then we generally cannot derive a factor from r. The problem is that we cannot distinguish between the cases $r = q_1$, q_2, and q_2' without further information (such as the relative sizes of the p_i or q_i).

The situation degenerates further as the number of prime factors of $\lambda(N)$ increases, and indeed as the number of prime factors p_i of N increases. Similarly, the accuracy of QOFA as an order-finding routine is reduced (increasing the expected runtime of SFA) when $\lambda(N)$ has a more complicated factorization.

For general integers N, therefore, we return to SFA. We note, however, that the expected number of calls to QOFA in SFA for general integers N can be reduced with two simple modifications. First, once the putative order r of a modulo N is calculated, we can easily compute $\gcd(r, N)$, which, if not 1, is a nontrivial factor of N. We note that this happens very often for N with a square factor (though it never happens for any RSA modulus).

Second, rather than restricting our search to even r, we could check whether r is a multiple of a small prime ℓ (for example, ℓ in $\{2, 3, 5\}$); if $a^{r/\ell}$ is not 1 modulo all of the factors of N, then it leads to a nontrivial factor of N. This essentially amounts to trial division of r.

These tricks, while unlikely to reveal the factors, are far less computationally expensive than rerunning QOFA. They may be worth trying when an iteration of SFA has not found the factors, before recalling QOFA. Simulating SFA for composite numbers N in $[10, 10^8]$ shows that these cheap improvements reduce the proportion of such N that escape factoring after a single correct call to QOFA with $a = 2$ by a factor of 4 (from 6% to 1.5%). For 60% of the remaining failures, we obtain $\mathrm{ord}_N(2) = 2^{-k}\lambda(N)$, from which we can find $\lambda(N)$ and then factor N using Miller's algorithm [20]. This gives a global efficiency gain over SFA of an order of magnitude.

CONCLUSION

We have presented a new quantum algorithm for factoring safe semiprimes, numbers used in cryptography. With high probability, our algorithm finds the factors from just one call to QOFA, and always outperforms SFA. This offers an improvement in terms of complexity on SFA, which fails to find the factors from each call to QOFA with probability 50%, but it also brings practical benefits. First, since each instance of QOFA requires a complicated physical experiment, the potential savings in runtime are large—much larger than that suggested by the improvement in computational complexity. Some architectures have particularly large overheads, as each call to QOFA requires the construction of a new circuit.

The second benefit is that we can fix the value of a, rather than picking it at random as in SFA. We chose $a = 2$ because it matches the dimension of the qubit, which is often used to construct quantum computers, although other sensible choices exist; experimentalists may even wish to tailor a value to the circuit they are building.

Finally, in the unlikely event that our algorithm fails, the factors can usually be found by rerunning the exact same quantum circuit, saving time in the lab.

Interestingly, safe semiprimes—which were used in classical encryption precisely because they were believed to be hard to factor—are the easiest numbers to factor with a quantum computer. Two forces push in the same direction: the order is very likely to give $\lambda(N)$ (from which the factors are easily found); and QOFA performs well when given a safe semiprime, returning the order more often than when acting on a general number.

As we move away from this class to weaker semiprimes our algorithm becomes inefficient, and we revert to SFA, boosted by two improvements. We note that even classical techniques that are unlikely to work can save time if they avoid rerunning QOFA.

Much work has been done on improving the quantum part of SFA. We have shown that improving the classical routines, using simple classical mathematics, can speed up quantum factoring by reducing the dependence on the quantum circuit. Our intuition is that this is a promising path, which will yield more improvements in efficiency.

[1] P. W. Shor, "Polynomial time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer," *SIAM J. Sci. Statist. Comput.*, vol. 26, p. 1484, 1997.

[2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge U.P., 2000.

[3] L. M. K. Vandersypen, M. Steffen, G. Breyta, C. S. Yannoni, M. H. Sherwood, and I. L. Chuang, "Experimental realization of Shor's quantum factoring algorithm using nuclear magnetic resonance," *Nature*, vol. 414, no. 6866, pp. 883–887, 2001.

[4] C.-Y. Lu, D. E. Browne, T. Yang, and J.-W. Pan, "Demonstration of a compiled version of Shor's quantum factoring algorithm using photonic qubits," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 99, no. 25, p. 250504, 2007.

[5] B. P. Lanyon, T. J. Weinhold, N. K. Langford, M. Barbieri, D. F. V. James, A. Gilchrist, and A. G. White, "Experimental demonstration of a compiled version of Shor's algorithm with quantum entanglement," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 99, p. 250505, Dec 2007.

[6] A. Politi, J. C. F. Matthews, and J. L. O'Brien, "Shor's quantum factoring algorithm on a photonic chip," *Science*, vol. 325, no. 5945, p. 1221, 2009.

[7] E. Martin-Lopez, A. Laing, T. Lawson, R. Alvarez, X.-Q. Zhou, and J. L. O'Brien, "Experimental realization of Shor's quantum factoring algorithm using qubit recycling," *Nat Photon*, vol. 6, pp. 773–776, 11 2012.

[8] E. Lucero, R. Barends, Y. Chen, J. Kelly, M. Mariantoni, A. Megrant, P. O'Malley, D. Sank, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, T. White, Y. Yin, A. N. Cleland, and J. M. Martinis, "Computing prime factors with a Josephson phase qubit quantum processor," *Nat Phys*, vol. 8, pp. 719–723, 10 2012.

[9] T. Monz, D. Nigg, E. A. Martinez, M. F. Brandl, P. Schindler, R. Rines, S. X. Wang, I. L. Chuang, and R. Blatt, "Realization of a scalable shor algorithm," *Science*, vol. 351, no. 6277, pp. 1068–1070, 2016.

[10] R. Laubenbacher and D. Pengelley, "'voici ce que j'ai trouvé:' Sophie Germain's grand plan to prove Fermat's last theorem," *Historia Mathematica*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 641–692, 2010.

[11] J. M. Pollard, "Theorems on factorization and primality testing," *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, vol. 76, pp. 3049–3052, 1974.

[12] R. L. Rivest and R. D. Silverman, "Are 'strong' primes needed for RSA?." Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2001/007, 2001.

[13] H. W. Lenstra, Jr., "Factoring integers with elliptic curves," *Ann. of Math. (2)*, vol. 126, no. 3, pp. 649–673, 1987.

[14] R. Cramer and V. Shoup, "Signature schemes based on the strong RSA assumption," *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.*, vol. 3, pp. 161–185, Aug. 2000.

[15] G. Leander, "Improving the Success Probability for Shor's Factoring Algorithm," *arXiv: quant-ph/0208183*, Aug. 2002.

[16] I. L. Markov and M. Saeedi, "Constant-optimized quantum circuits for modular multiplication and exponentiation," *Quantum Info. Comput.*, vol. 12, pp. 361–394, May 2012.

[17] T. Lawson, "Odd orders in Shor's factoring algorithm," *Quantum Information Processing*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 831–838, 2015.

[18] E. Knill, "On Shor's quantum factor finding algorithm: Increasing the probability of success and tradeoffs involving the fourier transform modulus." Tech. Report LAUR-95-3350, Los Alamos Natl. Lab, 1995.

[19] R. L. Rivest, A. Shamir, and L. Adleman, "A method for obtaining digital signatures and public-key cryptosystems," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 21, pp. 120–126, 1978.

[20] G. L. Miller, "Riemann's hypothesis and tests for primality," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 300 – 317, 1976.